UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/051,022	01/22/2002	Herve Ruellan	01807.002304	7645

5514   7590   01/22/2007
FITZPATRICK CELLA HARPER & SCINTO
30 ROCKEFELLER PLAZA
NEW YORK, NY 10112

EXAMINER
SERRAO, RANODHI N

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2141	

SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD OF RESPONSE	MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
3 MONTHS	01/22/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.

PTOL-90A (Rev. 10/06)

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
Office Action Summary	10/051,022	RUELLAN ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Ranodhi Serrao	2141	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE <u>3</u> MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>*28 November 2006*</u>.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**.   2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1,2 and 4-18* is/are pending in the application.

    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1,2 and 4-18* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

    a)☐ All   b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

      1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

      2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

      3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1)☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2)☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3)☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

4)☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .

5)☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application

6)☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

1.   A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set

forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this

application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set

forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action

has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 28

November 2006 has been entered.

Response to Arguments

2.   Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1, 2, and 4-18 have been

considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

3.   The applicant argued in substance the newly added limitations of independent

claims 1 and 12. However, the new grounds teach these and the added features. See

rejections below.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4.   The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can

be found in a prior Office action.

5.   Claims 1 and 16-18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable

over Wilkins (2004/0027593) and Cheng et al. (6,151,643).

6.   As per claim 1, Wilkins teaches a method of undoing a function requested by a

first client station on a computer object stored on a server station of a communication

network, comprising the following steps: receiving from a client station a request to undo

execution of the function on the computer object, the execution of the function being

adapted to manipulate the object from an earlier state to a manipulated state of the

object (see Wilkins, ¶ 4 and 18-19); obtaining on said server station the earlier state of

the manipulated object (see Wilkins, ¶ 52). But fails to teach sending a response to the

first client station via the communication network, the response comprising a sum of

money less than or equal to an execution cost received by the server station for the

execution of said function. However, Cheng et al. teaches sending a response to the

first client station via the communication network, the response comprising a sum of

money less than or equal to an execution cost received by the server station for the

execution of said function (see Cheng et al., col. 17, line 56-col. 18, line 3). It would

have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to

modify Wilkins to sending a response to the first client station via the communication

network, the response comprising a sum of money less than or equal to an execution

cost received by the server station for the execution of said function in order to restore

the client computer to its state prior to the installation, including restoring any files that

were deleted or altered (see Cheng et al., col. 3, lines 40-63).

7.   As per claims 16, 17, and 18, Cheng et al. and Wilkins teach a method of

undoing a function (see Wilkins, ¶ 16).

8.   Claims 2, 4, 6-8, 10, 11, and 15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being

unpatentable over Wilkins and Cheng et al. as applied to claim 1 above, and further in

view of Cockrill et al. (6,473,740).

9.   As per claim 2, Wilkins and Cheng et al. teach the mentioned limitations of claim

1 above but fail to teach an undo method, further comprising a stop of generating

money on the server station, associated with the first client station. However, Cockrill et

al. teaches an undo method, further comprising a stop of generating money on the

server station, associated with the first client station (see Cockrill et al., col. 13, lines 27-

58). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the

invention to modify Wilkins and Cheng et al. to an undo method, further comprising a

stop of generating money on the server station, associated with the first client station in

order to in order to substantially lower merchants' transaction processing costs, thereby

enabling merchants to offer for sale modestly-priced goods (see Cockrill et al., col. 5,

lines 11-25).

10.   As per claims 4, 6-8, 10, 11, and 15, the above-mentioned motivation of claim 2

applies fully in order to combine Wilkins, Cheng et al., and Cockrill et al.

11.   As per claim 4, Wilkins, Cheng et al., and Cockrill et al. teach an undo method,

wherein the sum of money is strictly less than the sum received (see Cockrill et al., col.

16, lines 32-53).

12.   As per claim 6, Wilkins, Cheng et al., and Cockrill et al. teach an undo method,

wherein the undo cost is zero if the number of requests for executions of undone

functions sent by the client station is less than a predetermined threshold value (see

Cockrill et al., col. 16, lines 32-53).

13.   As per claim 7, Wilkins, Cheng et al., and Cockrill et al. teach an undo method,

further comprising the following steps: receiving a request to undo the execution of a

function, sent by a second client station of the communication network, the undo

request comprising a sum of electronic money; and sending a second response to the

second client station via the communication network (see Cockrill et al., col. 12, lines

21-31), the second response comprising a sum of electronic money less than or equal .

to said sum of electronic money included in the undo request (see Cockrill et al., col. 16,

lines 32-53).

14.   As per claim 8, Wilkins, Cheng et al., and Cockrill et al. teach an undo method,

further comprising a step of generating electronic money on the server station

associated with the second client station (see Cockrill et al., col. 13, lines 27-58).

15.   As per claim 10, Wilkins, Cheng et al., and Cockrill et al. teach an undo method,

wherein at said obtaining step, an opposite function, which is the reverse of the function,

is executed (see Cockrill et al., col. 16, lines 21-31).

16.   As per claim 11, Wilkins, Cheng et al., and Cockrill et al. teach an undo method,

wherein it is implemented on a list of functions executed subsequently to the function to

be undone (see Cockrill et al., col. 16, lines 8-20).

17.   As per claim 15, Wilkins, Cheng et al., and Cockrill et al. teach an undo device,

characterized in that it is incorporated in a microprocessor, a read only memory adapted

to store a program for remote undoing of functions; and a random access memory

comprising registers adapted to store variables modified during the execution of said program (see Cockrill et al., col. 9, lines 22-42).

18.   Claims 5 and 9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Cheng et al. and Wilkins as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Hiroya et al. (5,754,654).

19.   As per claim 5, Cheng et al. and Wilkins teach the mentioned limitations of claim 1 above but fail to teach an undo method, further comprising a step of calculating an undo cost associated with the received undo request, wherein the sum of money included in the response to the first client is calculated after deduction of the undo cost. However, Hiroya et al. teaches an undo method, further comprising a step of calculating an undo cost associated with the received undo request (see Hiroya et al., col. 21, lines 22-34), wherein the sum of money included in the response to the first client is calculated after deduction of the undo cost (see Hiroya et al., col. 6, line 63-col. 7, line 8). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Cheng et al. and Wilkins to an undo method, further comprising a step of calculating an undo cost associated with the received undo request, wherein the sum of money included in the response to the first client is calculated after deduction of the undo cost in order to provide an electronic ticket vending and refunding system and a method thereof for working when a plurality of ticket venders share only one electronic ticket vending and refunding system in a system for purchasing or refunding a ticket

from a distant place using a telephone line for preventing forgery or illegal reproduction

of an electronic ticket (see Hiroya et al., col. 3, lines 18-28).

20.   As per claim 9, Cheng et al., Cockrill et al. and Wilkins teach the mentioned

limitations of claims 1 and 7 above but fail to teach an undo method, further comprising

a step of calculating a second undo cost associated with the undo request received

from the second client station, wherein in the step of sending the second response, the

sum of money included in the second response is calculated by deducting the second

undo cost from the sum of money included in the undo request of the second client

station. However, Hiroya et al. teaches an undo method, further comprising a step of

calculating a second undo cost associated with the undo request received from the

second client station, (see Hiroya et al., col. 21, lines 22-34: wherein it would be obvious

to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to add a second client

in a communication network); wherein in the step of sending the second response, the

sum of money included in the second response is calculated by deducting the second

undo cost from the sum of money included in the undo request of the second client

station (see Hiroya et al., col. 6, line 63-col. 7, line 8). It would have been obvious to one

having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Cheng et al., Cockrill

et al. and Wilkins to an undo method, further comprising a step of calculating a second

undo cost associated with the undo request received from the second client station,

wherein in the step of sending the second response, the sum of money included in the

second response is calculated by deducting the second undo cost from the sum of

money included in the undo request of the second client station in order to an electronic

ticket vending and refunding system and a vending and refunding method thereof for

working when a transaction using electronic money and an electronic ticket is executed

via a telephone line for preventing a trouble on whether the electronic money and the

electronic ticket are given or received actually (see Hiroya et al., col. 3, lines 30-35).

21.   Claims 12-14 have similar limitations as to claims 1, 2, 4-11, and 15-18 above;

therefore, they are being rejected under the same rationale.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the

examiner should be directed to Ranodhi Serrao whose telephone number is (571)272-

7967. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:00-4:30pm, M-F.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's

supervisor, Rupal Dharia can be reached on (571)272-3880. The fax phone number for

the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent

Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published

applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status

information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For

more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you

have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business

Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

RUPAL DHARIA
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER